

## **COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT**

**July 16, 2007**

**Aldermen Garrity, O'Neil,  
Osborne, Gatsas, Duval**

**4:00 PM**

**Aldermanic Chambers  
City Hall (3<sup>rd</sup> Floor)**

Chairman Garrity called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Garrity, Osborne, Gatsas (arrived late), Duval

Absent: Alderman O'Neil

Messrs.: Aldermen Long, Smith, Forest and Lopez, Church DePrima, Tom Arnold, Kevin Sheppard, Bill Sanders, Chief Kane, Bob MacKenzie, Rick Riddle, Deputy Chief Simmons

Chairman Garrity addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Ratify and confirm poll conducted July 9, 2007 approving a request of the Police Department to donate a 1982 Commando Ranger Personnel Carrier (SWAT) vehicle to the City of Concord Police Department.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Duval, it was voted to ratify and confirm poll conducted.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Discussion relating to the Piscataquog River Park Flood Damage.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Duval, it was voted to remove item 4 for discussion.

Chairman Garrity stated Chuck I just handed a two-page letter from you about three minutes ago so why don't you just tell us briefly what the bullet points are and your recommendation.

Mr. Chuck DePrima, Acting Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Director, stated the bullet points of that letter are basically that we were...the park sustained significant damage in 2006 from what we call the "Mother's Day" floods. We began...we received FEMA obligation money, we moved forward, bid the project out, started reconstruction to get the fields back to their pre-flood condition and they were approximately 79 to 80% done when we got hit a second time with the floods this spring at which point we were essentially set back to zero on the progress that we made and I came before the committee in May to ask for an advancement of funds so that there wouldn't be any lapse in the construction progress between the two FEMA projects and we are approaching spending that money now...I have some folks from FEMA State Office Emergency Management and our consultant to hopefully answer any questions but it would be beneficial if we could receive more advanced funds to be reimbursed by FEMA.

Chairman Garrity stated just a question and then I'll yield to the Alderman from that ward (Alderman Smith). If you were to get the necessary funds today could you complete the project for the playing season?

Mr. DePrima replied the schedule that was e-mailed to me this morning from the contractor gave a completion date of October 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Chairman Garrity asked when does the season start?

Mr. DePrima replied they usually like to start practicing August.

Chairman Garrity called upon Alderman Smith.

Alderman Smith stated thank you, Mr. Chairman. In regards to this they start really soccer in the middle of August and they start playing the first week in September. This is not the first year, this is the second year...I talked with the athletic director he has varsity soccer boys and girls, JV's boys and girls and freshman...quite a number and then they have to use Rimmon Street and so forth like that behind there. Armand Forest has a couple of pictures I've been down there and it's deplorable the conditions down there...it's even a safety hazard. My questions would be that if it's not going to be done I would like to know the timetable with FEMA and the funds available otherwise my suggestion would go and I know it's a thing I'd like to go into the Special Reserve Revenue in a loan so that this project can be done and then we would pay back the loan to the account with the money from FEMA. This has been sitting around for a week or two and I'd just like to mention something. We had a big event...the swim meet...down at Head Street...Raco Theodore Park. These are the conditions...you couldn't get a fire truck through there. They had a softball tournament and the swim meet at the

same time...anybody's welcome to look at the pictures...you couldn't get anything. It says "no parking" they parked there and something has to be done. The only access into either one of those parks is really one way...there's no other way to get there...you come in one way, you go out one way...there's no other way to do it and I'm getting sick and tired of asking for funds every year and it seems like it's the bottom of the list and it's very vital and very vital right now to the youth in the area. As you know there's very few parks that have playgrounds and fields on the west side and since we fixed up the swimming pool I've got nothing but praise but everybody's asking especially the residents on Precourt Street and the high schools when is it going to be made available and I wish that this committee would see fit to pursue this and allocate some funds so we can get started on the project. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Garrity asked were you talking about both projects that you have interest in...the parking and the park?

Alderman Smith replied I most certainly am.

Chairman Garrity stated if we could just stick to the soccer fields right now then we'll address that one. We have a representative from FEMA...Chief (Kane). I guess the big question in this room is when is the FEMA money coming down.

Mr. Larry Martin, Public Assistance Coordinator for FEMA, replied I can't give you an exact date for that I wish I could but I do know we'll get on it and probably in a couple of weeks we would get the project worksheets done and verify the damages...it comes into me and I okay it. I'm not sure how long it's going to take maybe a month, maybe two months.

Chairman Garrity stated I'm sure somebody has a question on the amount. I guess I'll ask that...what's the amount that the City is going to be reimbursed...do you know that answer?

Mr. Martin replied I'm just seeing some of the paperwork now I've really got to review it. I just got a quote maybe ten minutes ago. I'm just getting my feet on the ground here, I've got to do some homework.

Alderman Osborne stated whatever the amount is, Sir, is it guaranteed?

Mr. Martin replied once I approve it it usually goes up to another level and 99% of the time it's approved and it goes to the state. I would say it would be approved.

Alderman Osborne asked but is there a guarantee?

Mr. Martin replied I can't give you any guarantees today.

Alderman Osborne stated I'm not saying you give me the guarantee...I'm just wondering when they come up with a figure is it guaranteed at that point from the state and so on.

Mr. Martin stated once a project worksheet is done...I haven't heard the word guaranteed before but it's approved for disbursement and we participate 75%.

Chairman Garrity noted that Alderman Gatsas had arrived.

Alderman Smith stated in regards to FEMA what seems to be the problem...this occurred Mother's Day...I imagine the paperwork was submitted by the City to the state and I don't know what the problem is. I have flood insurance down at the beach and I didn't have to go through this hardly at all with the federal government...I live in a tidal area. I can't see what the holdup has been since it was in the papers and well documented.

Mr. Martin stated I really can't give you a good reason why there's a hold up. I know that a lot of requests come in and there's a pile six inches high...sometimes you're at the top, sometimes you're closer to the bottom. On this one it just seems that you're closer to the bottom than the top. We didn't take Manchester and say jeez we'll put you on the bottom of the pile or anything. The only thing I can say now is let's move forward and get on it and get the thing done.

Alderman Smith stated I'd just like to follow-up. I think the safety of the youngsters is very, very important and this has been utilized morning, noon and night...there's Girls, Inc. there...everybody uses those fields down there and this isn't the first time...this is the second time...a double header we got hit with this and I'd like to see it cleared up and I'd like to see the youngsters down there playing where they should be and not in the streets.

Mr. Martin stated I agree with you.

Alderman Lopez asked Chuck did you get the \$362,000 from the May FEMA...the final funding expected from FEMA is \$362,886...is that the first flood?

Mr. DePrima replied that is for the most recent one.

Alderman Lopez stated so the \$341,000 is what you need to complete the job.

Mr. DePrima stated that is what we're anticipating being reimbursed 75%.

Alderman Lopez stated that would complete the job though right which is \$485,000 I think...something like that.

Mr. DePrima stated approximately \$483,848.

Alderman Lopez stated we're all squared up to \$341,848...that's what we're looking for.

Alderman Gatsas stated maybe we need to go a little slower. There's was an October 2005 flood, there was a May 2006 flood and there was an April 2007 flood...is that correct? Did we receive our money for the October '05 and how much was that?

Chief Kane replied we didn't have any damage during that flood, therefore, there was no request.

Alderman Gatsas stated there was no damage in the October flood I think there was.

Mr. DePrima stated not the October 2005 flood.

Alderman Gatsas asked is Mr. MacKenzie here?

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes, Sir.

Alderman Gatsas asked wasn't that part of the schedule for 2005 the floods, didn't we have some?

Mr. Robert MacKenzie, Director of Planning and Community Development, replied there was flooding and there was some operational costs to that but that as I remember was not declared a national emergency.

Alderman Gatsas interjected yes it was.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I do not believe.

Alderman Gatsas stated yes it was because I was in Concord and the Governor was out of the country at the time.

Mr. MacKenzie stated you're speaking of the Alstead flooding.

Alderman Gatsas stated right.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that area was determined a flood emergency area but Manchester in that flood did not sustain any major capital costs.

Chief Kane stated we did respond to Alstead and the Keene area and we were reimbursed for our expenses directly from the state at 100% for that.

Alderman Gatsas stated so there was no damage to the fields in October of '05.

Chief Kane stated no.

Alderman Gatsas asked what was the total damage in '06 and what did we submit and what did we get back from FEMA?

Mr. MacKenzie stated I can respond to that, Alderman. The total flood damage was \$1.425 million as recognized and approved by FEMA. Some of that was operational costs that we've gotten back but did not come back for capital projects. Some went to enterprises including the Airport and EPD. There's project's that are still underway...we have gotten the majority of the FEMA funding back but not the full amount because we still have to submit some final vouchers for some of the projects and we have not as yet received the 12.5% state funding.

Alderman Gatsas stated that was 12.5%.

Mr. MacKenzie stated correct.

Alderman Gatsas stated and the April was 12.5%.

Mr. MacKenzie stated correct.

Alderman Gatsas stated so we haven't received the '06 and how much is that total?

Mr. MacKenzie replied of the state monies the 12.5%.

Alderman Gatsas stated correct.

Mr. MacKenzie stated we will be getting back 12.5% of \$1.425 million. And, again some of that will go into fund balance because it was operational costs, some will go to EPD, some will go to Airport and some will come back through CIP basically to complete the project.

Alderman Gatsas stated so that's about \$178,000.

Mr. MacKenzie stated yes.

Alderman Gatsas asked can this Board determine that the whole \$178,000 go to the project?

Mr. MacKenzie replied the \$178,000 was already allocated to this project. So if you look up the start-ups for the repairs we projected that the state would put in 12.5% and that has occurred. We haven't got the funds yet but they have committed it now.

Alderman Gatsas asked how much was the damage in the '07 flood?

Mr. MacKenzie replied we have not yet gotten the numbers. I'm never comfortable until I see those project worksheets from FEMA and as the gentleman stated they would hope to have those in perhaps one to two months so we do not have a total yet for the '07 floods.

Alderman Gatsas asked how much did we submit?

Mr. DePrima replied is submitted on the preliminary damage assessment for my estimated like last time...\$500,000 seeing we sustained the same flood event essentially.

Alderman Gatsas stated so you submitted \$500,000 so if we assumed that that number is right we should be getting 87.5% of that roughly.

Mr. MacKenzie stated 12.5%, which would be roughly \$87,000...you said 87.5%.

Alderman Gatsas stated well 75% from FEMA and 12.5% from the state. So that's about \$437,500 that's going to be coming from somewhere we assume maybe.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that sounds correct.

Chairman Garrity asked Mr. MacKenzie did you state earlier that we still haven't received all of our reimbursement from FEMA from the May '06 floods?

Mr. MacKenzie replied that's correct. I know Finance has been docking those in as they come in and we have received a majority but not all of the funds.

Chairman Garrity asked do we know the approximate date of when we're going to have full reimbursement?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I have not been given a date and I don't suspect the Chief has been given a date. Some of that is we do have to provide the paperwork.

Chairman Garrity stated I'm quite sure it has a lot to do with red tape. I just have a big concern because I think what we're probably going to do is have a motion on the floor here for one time funds but if we're going to spend one time funds I want to make sure we get the money back in time and if we're not fully reimbursed from May '06 I'm concerned using one time funds for the April floods when we still haven't gotten our full reimbursement from May '06. How much is due back from FEMA...who would know that answer?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I know the Finance office has been tracking the reimbursements from FEMA not sure if Bill has those right at his fingertips.

Mr. William Sanders, Finance Officer, stated I don't have it for all of the damage that was sustained but on the Piscataquog event in May 2006, for example, we still have to submit paperwork I think probably for about \$100,000 of reimbursement.

Chairman Garrity stated so Mr. Sanders if we submit that paperwork for \$100,000 will we be fully reimbursed by FEMA for the May '06 floods?

Mr. Sanders replied there will have to be a final accounting for the site because as Mr. DePrima mentioned at the beginning they didn't complete 100% of the project that was originally approved by FEMA so because the second flood came through before they completed so there's some work to be done there in getting it resolved. But I would assume with the upcoming reimbursements assuming we get the paperwork in that we would get our full 75% of costs incurred yes.

Chairman Garrity stated again do you know the total due from FEMA to bring us up to full reimbursement from FEMA...do you have that amount...is it the \$100,000?

Mr. Sanders replied yes that would be my estimate without the final paperwork being pulled together.

Alderman Smith stated this flood occurred May 8<sup>th</sup> and you mean to say we're going through all of this paperwork and now I'm trying to get funds for 2007 and we haven't completed 2006 and I have from Ron Ludwig...May 6, 2006 and that's when it occurred. I'd like to have some answers as to why we aren't getting the



money and who's at fault. Are we not doing the paperwork and sending it up to Concord or are FEMA's officials lax...this is incredible...this is a year and a half almost.

Chairman Garrity stated I think part of the problem was is because the project wasn't completed from May '06 and then we had another flood is that correct, is that part of the problem?

Chief Kane replied yes that's part of the problem.

Chairman Garrity stated we can blame it on "Mother Nature" I guess.

Alderman Smith stated I understand and maybe I'm wrong I went down there every week and I understand one of the last things they had to do was the berm along the river. As far as I know from talking with the people from the construction company everything was right in place...now I might be wrong and got the wrong information but that's what I was told.

Alderman Forest stated I was going to start with but Aldermen Lopez and Gatsas pretty much covered the first part of my question about the '06 flood. The question I have is for Chuck...I know originally the lights, the Singer lights that were down there that was part of the May 8<sup>th</sup> flood of '06...we had sold them to Goffstown, Goffstown declined to purchase them so I know that there's at least a value of those of \$10,000 and with Ron Ludwig they were going to be used for the renovation of the Jr. Deb Softball field but they were destroyed in that May flood and I understand either from you or Ronnie I'm not sure who gave me the answer that because they were destroyed down at the Piscataquog soccer field that now the softball field cannot get them...I'm not sure if they were put in because they were totally destroyed in that flood and I'm trying to get an answer to that as to what's happening because the softball field lost out on at least \$10,000 worth of renovations that were being done down there because of these two floods.

Mr. DePrima stated I don't recall the exact situation. To the best of my recollection FEMA determined those to be non-insurable and allocated an amount far lower than \$10,000 for those...I think it was in the neighborhood of \$5,000.

Alderman Forest stated I know we sold them to Goffstown for \$10,000...the Board of Aldermen. We voted to sell them to Goffstown and then Goffstown backed out so I was assuming that there was at least a value of that \$10,000 because every time I ask it gets less and less and less. Are we going to get reimbursed for those lights through FEMA.

Mr. DePrima replied yes.

Alderman Forest stated I think the other things that's included in there is the foot bridge, is that part of the estimate of what has to be...I think the foot bridge is on Plum Island somewhere.

Mr. DePrima stated that was part of the original FEMA obligation...it's still moving forward.

Chairman Garrity stated Mr. Martin in your estimation you said two to three months we'd have reimbursement for the '07.

Mr. Martin stated no...I'm not sure how long it's going to be for reimbursement. Once we okay it basically the money goes to the state and then the state disburses it to the applicant. But, I would say and I'm just rough on it...don't hold me to it...but, I would say probably within three to four weeks the paperwork should be in and approved.

Chairman Garrity asked and at the state level?

Mr. Martin replied yes and then the state could disburse it...that's just my rough guess right now.

Chairman Garrity stated Chuck I'm still a little confused because we advanced \$142,000 from another line item. Is the contractor out there working right now?

Mr. DePrima replied not right now. They will be out there later this week.

Chairman Garrity asked does the contractor require...it's a change order right that he has on your desk...is the \$142,000 still...do you still have it so you can spend it on this?

Mr. DePrima replied it's being spent as we speak.

Alderman Gatsas asked can I get a little bit more clarity and I know Bob MacKenzie you said it was \$1.4 million...can we just talk about the Piscataquog River piece by itself?

Mr. MacKenzie replied sure. I can give you the exact amount...on the FEMA worksheets I thing was broken out into four projects. But, the total for the entire park was...

Alderman Gatsas stated now this would be the May '06 flood.

Mr. MacKenzie stated this would be the May '06 and it includes the fields but it also includes the pedestrian bridge and some out buildings that were separated out. The total amount was \$741,232.

Alderman Gatsas asked is that what FEMA approved?

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes.

Alderman Gatsas stated so if we take that number is that the 75% or is that the entire project and then there's 75% off of that?

Mr. MacKenzie stated that's the entire project so it's 75% of that would be FEMA money.

Alderman Gatsas stated so it's \$232,000 and if I took that times 87.5% because that's what the state would be paying is that correct?

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes.

Alderman Gatsas stated so we should have received somewhere in the vicinity of \$648,578 as total dollars coming from FEMA and the state or the state because they're the ones that cut the check.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that's correct.

Alderman Gatsas how much of that \$648,000 did we receive to date?

Mr. MacKenzie replied again that's the one that Mr. Sanders indicated that we've received everything except perhaps about \$100,000.

Mr. Sanders stated if I can clarify that. We've received about \$293,000 and that's all been from FEMA money, we've not received any from the state. You have to keep in mind of the \$741,000 we only had spent at the time of the second flood about \$418,000 so we had not spent the entire \$741,000 so I think that's part of the reason the reimbursements are slow.

Alderman Gatsas stated let me get a clarification...what you're saying was the work done...in other words we hadn't spent it or paid it but was the work done and in the process of being paid and then the flood came. There's got to be a

clarification there because the way I look at it it's \$741,000 if we had done \$700,000 of the work then the next bill going in should have been the same \$700,000.

Mr. DePrima stated there's one major exception between the first flood event and the most recent one and that is that we were at a point in the construction process when the baseball field had been entirely restored to its pre-flood condition prior to the 2006 floods, the soccer fields were mid-way through that and they were not stabilized sufficiently. We lost...

Alderman Gatsas interjected I'm not worried about the stabilization...I'm looking for the dollars that we spent because if we spent them and even though they weren't completed we should have at least been reimbursed to that point...that is where I think this is getting choked up in here. Would you say that the assessment...the \$741,000 was the May flood. Would you say the damage in the April '07 flood was as bad as the May '06 flood to the soccer fields or to the whole project?

Mr. DePrima stated to the whole project yes.

Alderman Gatsas asked more or less?

Mr. DePrima replied slightly more so because those fields did not have vegetative stabilization.

Alderman Gatsas asked so if we put in for \$741,000 the first time how did we put in for less money the second time? We put in \$741,000...you said to me the damage in the '07 flood was worse than the '06 flood.

Mr. DePrima stated included in that original amount was the pedestrian bridge.

Alderman Gatsas asked how much is that?

Mr. DePrima replied roughly \$60,000 for the bridge and then another I believe \$14,000 for the design of it.

Alderman Gatsas stated so let's say it's \$100,000. We should have at least been submitting \$641,000 for the '07 flood. How did we only submit \$500,000 or are we still submitting and corrected because if we submitted \$741,000 and I pull out \$100,000 for the bridge then we should have submitted \$641,000.

Mr. DePrima replied we're still in the process of submitting for the bridge.

Alderman Gatsas stated no, no...I understand. But, everything else other than the bridge. We should have submitted \$641,000 and we only submitted what \$500,000, Mr. MacKenzie?

Mr. MacKenzie replied we received \$293,000 according to Mr. Sanders.

Alderman Gatsas interjected not what we received, what we submitted for the April '07 flood.

Mr. MacKenzie stated oh April '07 the most recent.

Alderman Gatsas stated correct.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I think Mr. DePrima said that was \$500,000.

Alderman Gatsas stated my question is how is it \$141,000 less than what we submitted in '06 even though it may have been a worse flood to that area?

Mr. DePrima replied we were basing that estimate on the actual contract amount we signed to restore those floods the first time. We anticipated the same amount of damage, therefore, I estimated with the help of the consultant \$500,000 because that excluded the damage for the pedestrian bridge and several obligations... separate projects for the buildings that had not been restored yet.

Alderman Gatsas stated I'll try and go a little slower because maybe I'm not being clear if I may, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Garrity stated but there's some buildings in there too...there's a cost to those buildings too...he did not include the buildings either.

Alderman Gatsas stated in the second one.

Chairman Garrity stated right.

Alderman Gatsas asked were they done in the first one?

Mr. DePrima replied no.

Chairman Garrity stated they were submitted in the first one but not completed.

Alderman Gatsas asked how much was that? Is it another \$140,000? All I'm saying is whatever...if we submitted \$741,000 all in and if you pull out the bridge, the buildings out of that \$741,000 that's the number we've got to be at, it can't be less, it's got to be at least there or am I figuring out something wrong, Mr. Martin?

Mr. Martin replied I think that there's a proof for 2006, should be able to submit invoices to the state any they should be paying.

Alderman Gatsas stated my if understanding was we submitted \$741,000 for the '06 flood, the '07 flood was more damage...we should have at least submitted the same amount less the pieces that weren't repaired that were coming from the '06 money I would think. Give you an example...if we submitted \$741,000 and all the work was done at the \$741,000...the buildings, the bridge and everything else in '07 we would have submitted \$741,000...is that correct? We would have had to have done the work all over again.

Chairman Garrity stated but Alderman the bridge wasn't complete during that flood neither were the bridges...I mean the buildings and you submitted that to FEMA based on the quote you got from Core Construction is that right?

Mr. DePrima stated that is correct.

Chairman Garrity stated it came in lower...the quote came in at \$472,223 so he submitted \$500,000...should we submit for an extra \$250,000 or let FEMA use it for somebody else who could use it...it's a \$500,000 quote here to fix the park the way it's supposed to be so he submitted the \$500,000 request to FEMA. Is that pretty much it, Mr. DePrima?

Mr. DePrima replied essentially. In the initial request we anticipated since we were unfamiliar with the process we tried to submit a number that we felt at the very least cover what we anticipated for damage. When the second flood occurred we essentially new the point we were at because we had established better information so when we submitted the second one it was substantially less minus the money that we had not yet submitted for as part of the original application.

Chairman Garrity stated so you submitted the \$500,000 request from FEMA based on the quote you got to complete the project, is that right?

Mr. DePrima replied no...that was submitted before I even got the quote from the construction company.

Chairman Garrity stated but it turns out that it was pretty close right.

Mr. DePrima stated essentially based on the price that we had originally signed the contract for to repair the first flood's damage.

Chairman Garrity stated the footbridge and the buildings are going to get replaced based on the '06 reimbursement from FEMA.

Mr. DePrima stated that's correct.

Alderman Lopez stated I'd just like to go back. I was following everything until Mr. Sanders said we only received \$293,000 and you say you submitted \$500,000 to FEMA is that correct.

Mr. DePrima stated for the 2007.

Alderman Lopez stated when you say you submit do you submit it to Finance...do you submit it directly or Chief Kane or Planning or who?

Mr. DePrima stated for the 2007 floods.

Alderman Lopez asked who do you submit your request to?

Mr. DePrima replied the original...they call it the preliminary damage assessment form was submitted to the Fire Department who then forward it to FEMA.

Alderman Lopez stated Chief he submitted \$500,000 to you for reimbursement, do you have any backup paperwork because the Finance Officer's saying we only received \$293,000 and we should have received all of that money?

Chief Kane replied let me kind of clarify how that works a little bit. They don't submit it to the Fire Department. Basically what happens is each department works directly with the FEMA Project Manager...that department submits their paperwork to the Project Manager and that Project Manager approves it. Once that Project Manager approves the money and the federal government they ship it to the state, the state holds the money, they approve it and they ship the money to Finance. So in regard to the Fire Department we're kind of...once we hook up these two people together it's just a lot smoother to let them run the operation instead of having us in the middle of it. It basically goes between the City department, the Project Manager and Finance.

Alderman Lopez stated just a follow up...once that happens who's responsibility is it to check to make sure what the state or FEMA or whoever got the money is going to cut the check who follows it up...the department head that follows up or do you follow it up.

Chief Kane replied it's the department head.

Alderman Lopez stated the department head follows it up to make sure we get our money. It seems like FEMA owes us some money for quite a while...more than the month that you have indicated. So, Mr. Martin, I ask you could you intercede and find out where our money is.

Chairman Garrity stated we're short on 2006 monies from the reimbursement of FEMA...they haven't submitted it to the state.

Mr. MacKenzie stated if I could clarify, Mr. Chairman. Just to clarify when they talked about submissions there are two distinctly different types. Mr. DePrima did a submission of his estimate of flood damage for the '07 flood but that's just an estimate and that has not been processed by Mr. Martin. There's a final submission when we've done the work and we want reimbursement and that goes to the state and then we get our money back. So Mr. DePrima has not submitted \$500,000 to the state for payment. He submitted \$500,000 to Mr. Martin as a flood estimate damage for '07.

Alderman Gatsas stated Mr. MacKenzie we need to separate these two items because they're getting very confusing. We submitted \$741,000 for the '06 flood. How much money of that \$741,000 has the City of Manchester received?

Mr. MacKenzie replied Mr. Sanders indicated \$293,000.

Alderman Gatsas stated let's say \$300,000 for round numbers...so we're roughly short \$441,000 from the '06 flood.

Mr. MacKenzie stated yes.

Alderman Gatsas asked did we complete \$441,000 worth of work over there and how did we pay for it?

Mr. DePrima replied we did complete approximately...I don't have the most recent payment requisition but we did complete a substantial amount of that original work.



Alderman Gatsas asked did we complete \$300,000 or did we complete more? And, where did the additional money come from?

Mr. Rick Riddle, Business Service Officer, replied we're authorized to spend out money by resolution, the start up forms to spend the money so we spend what's authorized. Remember that the \$741,000 also includes a City portion which is about \$90,000 so I think it's like \$640,000 between the state and FEMA.

Alderman Gatsas stated \$648,000.

Mr. Riddle stated right but we've only spent again about \$408,000 so far...spent \$418,000.

Alderman Gatsas stated so what you're saying is...so we're waiting for reimbursement of '06 from the state for \$348,000.

Mr. MacKenzie stated if I could, Mr. Chairman, could I jump in again. If you do the math they've basically expended \$400,000. They have submitted and got reimbursed for 75% of that which is \$300,000 and that's what we've received. So, we have for all of the work we've done so far been reimbursed by FEMA for the correct amount. We have not received the state money yet. The State 12.5%, which would get it up to \$348,000, is what we have not received. So, we are...the Board appropriated the money, we have been expending the money in advance in anticipation of getting these reimbursements. And, that's why when we look at the '07 flood I'm not really comfortable coming to a number until FEMA does that worksheet. We found that once they do the project worksheets that number seems locked in and we will be reimbursed for it.

Alderman Gatsas stated we are owed on the first '06 floods...\$648,000 from the state and FEMA.

Mr. MacKenzie stated yes.

Alderman Gatsas stated if that's what we're owed and you're telling me we've only submitted \$300,000 or \$400,000 and we've gotten reimbursed for that then we're still owed another \$348,000 is that correct?

Mr. MacKenzie replied correct.

Alderman Gatsas stated so if I called tomorrow and tell them to expedite their payment they're going to send the City \$348,000.

Mr. MacKenzie stated no because the work has not been done yet. They've only done \$400,000 worth of work...there's still a lot of work to go...the '07 flood made it more complex but they have done \$400,000 worth of work which we've been reimbursed the 75% from FEMA but we've not been reimbursed the 12.5% from the State of New Hampshire.

Alderman Gatsas stated you're trying to drag...was the work...the '06 flood did you do all the repairs except for the pedestrian bridge?

Mr. DePrima stated except for the pedestrian bridge and what was left to be completed before winter conditions shut the contractor down...that may be part of the discrepancy that you're seeing. There was still work to be done that had not been paid yet.

Alderman Gatsas stated all right can we just go slowly with this...if we take the \$741,000 was there \$140,000 worth of work that wasn't completed for the '06 flood...the pedestrian bridge and whatever else you had roughly.

Mr. DePrima replied approximately.

Alderman Gatsas stated so that leaves \$600,000 worth of work that was completed and done, is that correct?

Mr. DePrima replied that's correct.

Alderman Gatsas stated and to date we've only received \$300,000 of that.

Chairman Garrity stated \$293,000...call it \$300,000.

Alderman Gatsas stated I'm just using round numbers.

Mr. DePrima stated I'm not entirely sure what we've been reimbursed.

Alderman Gatsas stated they're telling us \$293,000...I'm saying \$300,000. So there's \$300,000 out there of which a piece is owed by the City, a piece is owed by the state and 75% of FEMA is on the \$600,000. So somebody needs to get that cleared up because we've done the work and we're not getting reimbursed for it and the flood of '07 created the damage...isn't that what I understand?

Mr. DePrima replied yes.

Alderman Gatsas stated so the damage that was created was based on \$600,000 even though you only got an estimate for \$432,000 we put \$600,000 worth of work in there from what I'm told.

Mr. DePrima stated including the pedestrian bridge.

Alderman Gatsas interjected without the pedestrian bridge. There was \$471,000 in '06, we pulled out \$140,000 for the pedestrian bridge and the other buildings...was \$600,000...if we never had a flood after that we would have been done everything except the pedestrian bridge and the other buildings and we spent \$600,000 to get there.

Mr. DePrima stated yes that's correct.

Alderman Gatsas stated a new flood happened. We should have at least and I don't know how we got an estimate for \$472,000 when we had just completed work for \$600,000 a few months earlier but that's neither here nor there. Now, I guess that's what I don't understand but let's assume we got a reduction of \$125,000...the two are starting to mix with each other when we've already spent \$600,000 and we haven't been reimbursed for the \$600,000 and now a new flood comes along...we've already spent some money here...we spent a lot more than \$300,000 or am I losing something in the discussion.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the City has only spent on the park project \$408,000.

Alderman Gatsas asked once or twice?

Mr. MacKenzie replied once. So now we are facing a flood...you're looking at the discrepancies between the '06 and '07 floods but what you're missing is the fact that there was a significant amount of work that had not been done. I know you're trying to find that exactly but I think if you look at the records there's been \$408,000 work done...that was submitted to the state I think as of last November and the contractor was going to come back and I suspect there's probably retainage held of that contractor as well.

Chairman Garrity stated assuming FEMA will only pay on completed projects...that's already been stated right. So, if we didn't get a chance to complete the project before the next flood they won't pay on that remainder will they?

Mr. MacKenzie replied they will only pay on completed work.

Chairman Garrity stated completed work...so, if we didn't complete the bridge nor the out buildings before the next flood they're pay for it on the '07 reimbursement not the '06, is that right? I hate to confuse things a little bit more.

Mr. MacKenzie reiterated they will only pay for work that is done. So, when we're all done this project whether it's '06 or '07 when we're done the project they will reimburse us for the work that was done by the City.

Chairman Garrity stated Alderman Gatsas tells me they'll pay it in the '06 numbers because the damage was done in '06.

Mr. DePrima stated okay I didn't know if one superceded the other one.

Chairman Garrity stated I know it's pretty confusing...I think I know where you're going Alderman you want to the find the \$341,000 that they owe us for this don't you.

Alderman Gatsas stated somebody for some reason somebody's telling me we've done \$600,000 worth of work, Mr. MacKenzie's telling me we did \$408,000 worth of work...I'm really not interested in FEMA because all they do is move paperwork and the money comes into the state and then we submit.

Mr. MacKenzie stated maybe we can ask Mr. Riddle again how much money has been spent by the department on the Piscataquog flood damage.

Chairman Garrity interjected hold on...before we go down that road...I don't know if Bob you know this or Mr. Sanders...give me a total number that's due from the '06 floods from FEMA and from the state. We need that number, Mr. Sanders, do you have it because we're not going to get this meeting completed if we don't.

Mr. Sanders replied assuming...I regret I have to make one assumption that we would have spent the entire \$741,000...if I can say that. So, assuming we spent the entire \$741,000 in doing the '06 repairs we would still be due \$262,000 from FEMA and we would be due \$92,600 from the state so the total would be about \$354,000/\$355,000.

Chairman Garrity stated my next question to you, Mr. DePrima, if that was the case and we got the remaining dollars from the '06 flood and from the state in a timely manner can we get the project going because it's \$352,000...right...about there and you need \$341,848 according to your estimate here to get the project going, does that work?

Mr. DePrima replied yes.

Chairman Garrity stated it does work.

Mr. DePrima stated they submitted a schedule to us just this morning of an October 3<sup>rd</sup> completion date if I was to allow them to act immediately.

Chairman Garrity asked Mr. Sanders is that allowable? We need \$342,000 approximately for the park without the bridge. I think it's important that we get the fields done first right Alderman Smith?

Alderman Smith stated definitely.

Chairman Garrity asked can we do that...is that good accounting principles to use the '06 FEMA money and state money to get this project completed from the '07 floods and get the kids back on the field?

Mr. Sanders replied one it assumes that we're going to get the money promptly.

Chairman Garrity stated I guess as soon as we submit our...I guess it's partly our fault from what I'm hearing too because we haven't submitted some stuff.

Mr. Sanders stated I'm not sure we've spent all of the money and I don't have a definition of what spent means but I believe it means we've received invoices or we've paid on contracts and then we submit that information to the state and they pay on that.. The big piece of that \$741,000 is an encumbered amount of about \$140,000 that is still encumbered for work that we've not paid the contractor for so I don't know how we can get reimbursed for it until we pay the contractor.

Chairman Garrity asked isn't that why we made the transfer from the Douglas Street fields?

Mr. Sanders stated Douglas Street was done for the 2007 flood not for the 2006 flood.

Chairman Garrity stated this gets more confusing as time goes on doesn't it.

Alderman Gatsas stated how about if I make a motion that we take \$342,000 out of the one-time account to pay for the completion for the fields on the west side and then get an itemized detailed accounting for the '06 flood, what was paid, what was incurred and an itemized accounting of '07. We need to get the work done.

Chairman Garrity stated I can certainly understand we need to get the work done, Alderman, but if we don't have to take it out of the one-time and there's money coming from FEMA and the state I would prefer to do that.

Alderman Gatsas stated but if the agreement is that we take the money out of one-time and then when the money comes in from FEMA we just put it back in as a replacement.

Alderman Duval stated I think Alderman Gatsas has a real valid point. Basically, we have the money on-hand we need to sort of fill in the gap here for this time period and I just think that relying on reimbursement in the interim is a rather risky proposition and I think he's onto something that would probably be a suitable patch for the interim, Mr. Chairman. I would second the motion, Alderman Gatsas.

Chairman Garrity acknowledge the motions made by Alderman Gatsas, seconded by Alderman Duval.

Alderman Duval stated I just think it's too risky.

Chairman Garrity stated I think the '06 monies from FEMA and the state are going to be in fairly quick. It's not like we're waiting for '07.

Alderman Duval stated Mr. Chairman I've lost confidence and I'm sure Alderman Smith has lost confidence as well.

Alderman Gatsas stated I don't disagree with you, Mr. Chairman. All I'm saying is that we've been on this now for about an hour and I still don't know what's owed to us from '06 and neither does Finance or Planning and maybe they can give me numbers but I'm not confident and I certainly say let's get this thing done so they can get it done and get a clear accounting so somebody can put it on paper.

Chairman Garrity stated I have no doubt about that. I'm in favor of the motion but I'm just trying to think of a different way to do it. Mr. Sanders, Mr. MacKenzie, Me. DePrima can we get an update to the full Board of what the deal is with the '06 monies and what's coming to us from '06 FEMA monies and when we can expect that...from all three of you folks.

Alderman Duval stated by the end of the week, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Garrity stated by the end of the week would be much better.

Alderman Smith stated I certainly concur with my colleague...I did at the last meeting, Mr. Gatsas...Senator Gatsas...Alderman Gatsas. When the Special Revenue Account in 2003 there was \$8408,000...we have over \$5 million in the account right now and it could go higher with the Jac Pac proposal...we don't know. But if you're asking me personally and I'm very interested in this...I'd like to do it this way...it might hurt in a way but like you said before let's touch all the bases and get Parks and Recreation, FEMA, Finance Officer and also Mr. MacKenzie to get these forms and get them in as soon as possible and then we'll get our reimbursement from FEMA and the state...thank you very much.

Alderman Lopez stated I think you ought to proceed the way the motion is...the only thing I'd ask is that a phone poll vote be done, get it done and when this thing about FEMA and all that is really getting complicated and I don't think you're going to solve the problem in a week or so. So, if the motion passes I would certainly like a phone call vote...you don't have to call me because I'm going to vote on it and I think George Smith's going to vote on it and just move on and get the right numbers because there's confusion.

Chairman Garrity stated I'd have to disagree with you about FEMA...people just don't know who's on first, who's on second, who's on third...it's pretty simple if we had the numbers in front of us and what has to come from Parks to Planning or Planning to Parks and Finance...it's a pretty simple fix we just all need to get on the same page.

Alderman Osborne stated from the beginning I thought it is what it is and it has to be done.

Chairman Garrity stated absolutely and I don't disagree with it. Called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Discussion relating to the Police Department's priority of identifying funding for the replacement of police radios.

Alderman Duval stated Deputy just for clarification...I noticed in the letter dated June 8<sup>th</sup> from the Police Department actually from Deputy Lussier to Alderman Osborne's Committee on Public Safety there supposedly was a request made for the cost of the radio replacement in the amount of approximately \$175,000 and I'm just quoting in here from the letter...hopefully you have it in front of you...but the request was denied. I'm struggling with...there were a bunch of

things...let me back up...there were a bunch of things that were done during this budget process that really benefited the Police Department and the activities that the Police Department is able to do...there was a whole host of items that this Board I think prudently attended to and responded to the requests of the Police Department and some went actually over and above the request but this one seems to have escaped us and in speaking with other colleagues about the request it kind of caught us by surprise...it certainly caught me by surprise and I was somewhat disappointed because I think this would have been part of the discussion throughout the budget process and specifically CIP but it wasn't. What really concerns me is this quote and I don't know if it's a misquote or maybe it's misstated by Deputy Lussier but I need clarification for myself as to what is this "denied"...denied by whom?

Deputy Chief Simmons stated I can tell you that in the budget process one of our efforts is obviously to put in our CIP request for the year a typical wish list I guess you would say. In that our top priority at the time was to replace our radios piecemeal. The \$175,000 would be to replace 50 radios each year for the next five years. They're soup to nuts for each man...it's a portable radio, the charger, the battery and the caller mic...comes to approximately \$3,500 apiece. So this year in our CIP request we put in for the first year of implementation of 50 radios at \$175,000. As the budget proceeded through its courses as it was finalized that wasn't in the CIP budget. We weren't aware of what the whole process is, we were surprised that the CIP Committee wasn't aware of it, we learned a few weeks ago that you people weren't made aware of it, some of the other Aldermen had expressed concerns as well. We weren't really familiar...we assumed that once it sent through CIP as a request at least it would be brought to your attention, I don't know what the process is there. But, it was our top priority for this year.

Alderman Duval stated again just for Ward 4's representative on the Board it's just tragically alarming because of the great lengths we went to to try to beef up sort to speak in a whole bunch of different areas relative to Police activity and enforcement and to think that the police officers out there on the streets have basically deficient or obsolete methods of communicating is really quite alarming and I'm just wondering how the heck we're going to fix this on short order.

Deputy Chief Simmons stated I will tell you...I don't want to indicate to you that the sky is falling...something to that effect. I think we definitely have to address the problem. The radios are beyond their life expectancy...we understood that would happen and we didn't plan on having to replace these radios in five years...they are in the 10-year plan. What happened about a year and a half ago is the manufacturer decided they weren't going to make the particular hand held model that we have. They've come out with a new model...we've actually made some



purchases approximately 26 with some federal money. As we added additions to the complement the BMA has given us funding for equipment we included radios in that equipment so the last 15 officers that came on we were able to buy 15 new radios with those. So the purpose of the CIP request was to just start a scheduling program, get all the radios replaced within the 5-year span then we can start looking at a much more lenient, easier going scheduling replacement.

Chairman Garrity stated I'd like to follow up on those comments. I'm disappointed that the CIP Committee did not hear anything from the upper level management of the Police Department. The process through the CIP budget has been the same for the past six years. The previous Chairman Alderman O'Neil has done the same thing that I've done. We send out a memo to all 14 of our colleagues...if you need anything let us know...department heads are always asking each Aldermen for things. Deputy Leidemer was at the CIP hearing for Weed 'N Seed and I believe there was a member of the CIP Committee that asked do you need anything else because we funded the Weed 'N Seed and it's been the same process for six years and to find out about it last week that you need radios is pretty disappointing. Was that the first time that you made a request for radios this CIP season?

Deputy Chief Simmons replied for new schedule yes.

Chairman Garrity stated so requests in the past was not made three, four, five years ago.

Deputy Chief Simmons stated no.

Alderman Gatsas asked was the request made to the Mayor?

Deputy Chief Simmons replied through CIP I guess. It's my understanding now, Alderman, that the Mayor looked at the CIP requests and I don't know what that whole process is so I guess if he looks at it, he saw our request yes.

Alderman Gatsas asked are these the same radios that we got \$750,000 worth of federal funds to replace interoperability through the State Police?

Deputy Chief Simmons replied no. We just recently received about \$225,000 from the state.

Alderman Gatsas stated I'm talking about maybe 2000 or 2001.

Deputy Chief Simmons stated we never got those radios. At the time...I think we've had this discussion...that was at the time a previous administration elected not to go with an interoperability radio they went with what is called a path system at the time that allowed some intercommunication when another department or agency came into our City...that never quite worked the way it was supposed to. As a result we recently received funding through the state to get interoperability radios through Homeland Security and that's what we have done. The interoperability radio is a completely separate system from the 800 MHz system that the City has and our current portable radios.

Alderman Gatsas asked so are we going to an interoperability system or not?

Deputy Chief Simmons replied we will have both of those. We will have interoperability in that cruiser but we will also have our regular 800 MHz radio in that cruiser.

Alderman Gatsas asked is there a reason why we have both of them?

Deputy Chief Simmons replied yes. In laymen's terms the simplest way to explain it and again I'm a layman when it comes to this it's similar to AM/FM. The 800 MHz is like an AM...it's good in a high-density area like a city, the interoperability is good long distance like an FM station would be.

Alderman Gatsas asked can you tell me does Nashua have both of them?

Deputy Chief Simmons replied Nashua has 800 MHz, I believe they've applied for interoperability, I don't know if they have it yet...that would be what we just received. But, they're under the 800 MHz system just like we are.

Alderman Gatsas stated so what you're saying to me is the 1,200 radios that were purchased in 2001 we didn't get any of them with Homeland Security funds.

Deputy Chief Simmons stated Alderman I don't know about 1,200 radios. I know that back 10 years ago the entire City went to the 800 MHz system. The entire City was given these radios...Highway has them, we have them, Parks and Rec I believe have them and the radios we're requesting now are only are portable radios. We don't want to replace the 800 MHz system...that's a very functional system for the City. We're only now looking to replace the hand held portables the officers carry on their belts.

Alderman Lopez stated let me offer a suggestion to the Committee to consider. Taking the money out of the one-time account for this or finding the money but I think what could happen here is that these radios are the number one priority. I think the \$175,000...I think there's plenty of money in the salary adjustment because you won't be up to 125 police officers for the full year and you'll have some retirements and I think as time goes along we work this...there's money in the contingency account to add to that, there's money in the salary adjustment account to add back to the salaries at the end of the year. You got over a \$21 million budget and we just started the year so there's plenty of money. If the radios are a priority I would ask the Committee to consider letting them order and move in \$175,000 out of salary line item.

Chairman Garrity stated I don't think this Committee can do that. I would urge my colleagues that we always seem to find some dough kicking around in CIP funds so I'm going to put Bob MacKenzie and Sam Maranto on it and see if we can find some dough for that.

Alderman Gatsas asked we received how much from the Feds...\$225,000.

Deputy Chief Simmons replied from the state yes...Homeland.

Alderman Gatsas stated so if I took the \$225,000 and divided that by \$3,500...that's 64 radios and we gave you funding for 15...we're at 80 and you're looking to do the replacement in a 5-year period.

Deputy Chief Simmons stated correct.

Alderman Gatsas stated if we've done 80 in the first year.

Deputy Chief Simmons interjected no we have not. The money we received from Homeland money is for interoperability radios. Those aren't the 800 MHz radios. We have not received any funding for 800 MHz hand held radios from the state, from Homeland.

Alderman Gatsas stated so I guess my question is is the availability to run on one system there so that we're not having two different systems in operation and buying two different radios...so what you're telling me is one radio is \$3,500...how much is the other one?

Deputy Chief Simmons replied off hand I think those were around \$5,000.

Alderman Gatsas stated so we're at \$9,500 per policeman just for radios.

Deputy Chief Simmons stated no. The money we received for the interoperability radios went into police cruisers...each cruiser has a radio system built into the car. What we did there is we exchanged...there's a faceplate and we exchanged the faceplate that allows that radio to switch between 800 MHz and the interoperability VHF radio systems. So, we haven't replaced those we just upgraded those. Additionally we received I don't recall the number I believe it was about 20 hand held VHF radios, interoperability radios that will be put in charges in the trunks of the cars. If an officer from Manchester goes to Goffstown or a surrounding area they can utilize those portable radios to interact with those agencies if they have to. But, those radios and that system is completely separate from our 800 MHz and I would not suggest that we go away from our 800 MHz system and go to a VHF for the City because again it's like an AM/FM type of situation...it's not practical for the density of the City.

Alderman Gatsas stated so the radio that somebody's putting in the trunk is how much and that's only good for Goffstown or surrounding communities.

Deputy Chief Simmons stated no actually a week ago all the way up to Berlin and used that. We couldn't communicate with Manchester in Berlin but we could communicate with those surrounding areas.

Alderman Gatsas asked where did we get the money for that?

Deputy Chief Simmons replied that was Homeland Security money.

Alderman Gatsas asked does Homeland Security say that you can't use it on the 800 MHz?

Deputy Chief Simmons replied that's correct...that's interoperability.

Chairman Garrity stated we will go to Alderman Duval because I know he has an appointment.

Alderman Duval stated what I'd like to see...I think there's an opportunity for a funding mechanism at least for the first phase...purchasing the replacement radios, Mr. Chairman. I would think that maybe with Mayor Guinta's assistance working with the Police Department...understanding that this is a real priority...that we treat this as a priority and to move forward and maybe they can report back to us...the Mayor's office, the Police Chief, Mr. MacKenzie...report back to the full Board as to a possible funding mechanism at least to get it started. I'd like to make that in the way of a motion.

Chairman Garrity stated I will accept that motion. Do I have a second to that motion?

Alderman Osborne duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Garrity stated as everybody has seen in the past there's an awful lot of line items in the CIP budget and there's always a few dollars left in each account and once a project's complete.

Alderman Duval stated along the lines of what Alderman Lopez was suggesting I think we amply funded the Police Department budget this year and I think we can sort of tie along some funding sources that we can get this started and completed.

Chairman Garrity stated but if we could get out of a number of sources rather than just contingency.

Alderman Duval stated I agree...I totally, absolutely agree.

Alderman Osborne asked how much of a timeline do we have on this?

Deputy Chief Simmons replied the sooner the better but again I don't want to tell you that the sky is falling.

Chairman Garrity asked the next full Board meeting would be acceptable...the August Board meeting would be acceptable?

Deputy Chief Simmons replied yes.

Alderman Long stated from what I understand, Deputy, there's only one vendor that supplies these that we use. We don't go out to bid with these?

Deputy Chief Simmons replied we do go out to bid but there's one vendor that's primarily the low bidder and the one that we've been going with that provided radios.

Alderman Long stated also with the 800 MHz radios there's interference due to cell phone, two-way walkie-talkie radios...are you aware of that?

Deputy Chief Simmons replied no.

Alderman Long stated there's a couple of associations that have a report on it...one is the National Public Safety Telecommunications Council which is the International Association of Police Chiefs, Association of Public Safety Communications Officials, National Public Safety Telecommunications Council... some brands are better than others. So I don't know if we're pigeonholed into buying these particular...I just printed out a contract with Minnesota...they bought portable radios Motorola's...83 of them for \$168,000 which broke down to \$2,000 each and also the other problem is with the dishes...the cell phone dishes...now we've been authorizing dishes to be put on towers and I'm wondering if that is also causing interference.

Deputy Chief Simmons stated I'm not aware of any problem. The only radio problems that we ever have are dead spots in different parts of the City, which has been common with every radio system we've had. I'm not aware of anything new coming up as a result of any other equipment that's been placed in the City.

Chairman Garrity called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Communication from the Deputy Public Works Director requesting the assignment of a "recycled" police cruiser for use by the Solid Waste Compliance Officer.

On motion of Alderman Gatsas, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to approve the request of the Deputy Public Works Director.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 7 of the agenda:

7. Communication from the Engineering Manager, on behalf of Alderman DeVries, requesting funds for construction of drain lines on Lebel Street and Skyline Drive.

Chairman Garrity stated I know that that was a request in the CIP process and there was no funding available.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Gatsas, it was voted for discussion.

Mr. Kevin Sheppard, Deputy Public Works Director, stated I believe that can be received and filed...funding was granted in the '08 budget.

Alderman Osborne stated I have a question regarding drainage and everything... what about up above Mammoth Road? When do you think that is actually going to start?

Mr. Sheppard replied we're looking that as part of our CSO (Combined Sewer Overflow) program so that's being studied.

Alderman Osborne asked how long is that?

Mr. Sheppard replied the next phase of the CSO begins in 2010.

Alderman Osborne stated I'm talking about Cemetery Brook.

Mr. Sheppard stated we're looking at that area though before then. Hopefully, there may be something we can do to start.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Gatsas, it was voted to receive and file.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 8 of the agenda:

8. Petition for discharge of a portion of Pine Ridge Avenue.

Chairman Garrity asked will this item require a road hearing?

Mr. Sheppard replied no it will not.

Alderman Gatsas asked where is Pine Ridge located?

Mr. Sheppard replied it's in the Youngsville area off Bridge Street Extension, Bailey Avenue.

Chairman Garrity stated so it will not need a road hearing.

Mr. Sheppard stated the City Solicitor feels it needs one but our surveyor had taken a look at that but obviously.

Deputy City Solicitor Arnold stated this is just a discharge from public servitude.

On motion of Alderman Gatsas, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to approve the petition submitted.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 9 of the agenda:

9. Petition for Discontinuance of North Turner Street and Verney Street.

Alderman Osborne moved to recommend discontinuance. Alderman Gatsas duly seconded the motion.

Mr. Sheppard stated Verney Street I don't believe needs any action. I think that's similar to the previous one.

Chairman Garrity stated one says discontinuance and the other one says discharge is that the same?

Mr. Sheppard replied Verney would be discharged...I think that same action and I believe No. Turner would need a road hearing.

Chairman Garrity called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 10 of the agenda:

10. Sewer abatement request (172 W. Shore Avenue).  
(*Note: EPD recommends an abatement in the amount of \$148.50 be granted.*)

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Gatsas, it was voted to recommend approval of the sewer abatement request in the amount of \$148.50.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

Amending Resolution and budget authorization authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Seven Thousand Dollars (\$7,000) for the FY2007 CIP 210107 Homeless Healthcare Program.



On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Gatsas, it was voted to recommend approval of the resolution and budget authorization.

Amending Resolution and budget authorization authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Two Thousand Dollars (\$2,000) for the FY2007 CIP 214007 Southern NH Area Health Education Center Program.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Gatsas, it was voted to recommend approval of the resolution and budget authorization.

CIP Budget Authorization:

810307            Hackett Hill Business Park – Revision #1

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Gatsas, it was voted for discussion.

Alderman Gatsas asked can somebody tell me what it's for.

Chairman Garrity stated I believe it's a project extension to December 31' 2007.

Alderman Gatsas asked how much work has been done?

Mr. MacKenzie replied this is simply a request for extension. No monies for construction have been expended yet. There are plans for construction and MHRA has hired an engineer and completed construction plans. There have been administrative costs that have come out of it to the MHRA but no construction at this point.

Alderman Gatsas asked are we assuming that the completion date is within reality? How many times have we extended this?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I'm not sure how many times and I'm not sure how realistic it is.

Alderman Gatsas asked so why are we doing it?

Mr. MacKenzie replied because the monies are not lapsable monies...these were monies that came in from another project and they have to be continued. The Board could always look at the money and see what the uses are for but we did want to continue the money because...

Alderman Gatsas asked can this money be used on Piscataquog?

Mr. MacKenzie replied no. This particular money has to be used for the Hackett Hill Business Park.

Alderman Gatsas asked where did it come in from?

Mr. MacKenzie replied it came in from the sale...I don't have the start-up in front of us...is this in the order of \$785,000...is that the same one...these monies are the ones that came from the sale of French Hall.

Alderman Gatsas stated I don't think we should keep extending it because I don't think it'll get done.

Chairman Garrity stated I tend to agree with you.

Alderman Gatsas stated well if you do it's going to die because the votes 2-to-1.

Chairman Garrity stated let's do it one more time.

Alderman Gatsas stated I'm not doing it one more time.

Alderman Osborne moved to recommend approval of the CIP budget authorization. Chairman Garrity duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Gatsas duly recorded in opposition.

### **TABLED ITEM**

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Gatsas, it was voted to remove item 11 from the table for discussion.

11. Security estimate provided by Pelmac Industries for property located behind the West Side Ice Arena and the Jr. Deb Softball field.  
*(Tabled 10/23/2006 pending reports from Parking, Planning and CIP.)*

Alderman Forest stated I have no idea what the report would be from Parking but the original request that apparently came to me the last time I came before this Committee was from Alderman O'Neil who stated that he wanted to know why Pelmac always receives the contract. I thought I had done it once before but I did it again. I had Red Robidas send you a letter, which you should all have a copy of about why Pelmac gets the security contracts. Apparently, there was an RFP sent out, Pelmac was the low bidder and I guess they're on a contract to do City buildings. I know Alderman O'Neil had asked whether we could save money

doing it in house but because of the wiring that's needed to hook up the computers and all that apparently it was said that it would not be saving any money to do it in house. What I'm asking is that this Committee send it forward to the full Board... mainly I've been waiting for this since May of last year. We've had one truck arson down there, we've had all kinds of vandalism and dumping and this system is really needed down there...it's wide open and we need to catch these people that are dumping down there and security at both the West Side Arena and the ballpark. So, I'm just asking that this Committee vote in favor and send it to the full Board so we can get the system installed. Thank you.

Chairman Garrity asked is there a security system down there currently?

Alderman Forest replied other than the building alarm on the West Side Arena no.

Chairman Garrity asked Mr. MacKenzie do we possibly have a funding source for this yet?

Mr. MacKenzie replied the only possible source at this point is if it was considered part of the Piscataquog River Park area. There was a couple of projects that came in a little bit under estimate that's how we were able to fund the \$142,000 and if this project doesn't go much more than let's say \$15,000 there would be money in that Piscataquog or the Parks Improvement Program which was a total of \$1.8 million and a good chunk of that was towards this Piscataquog Park area.

Chairman Garrity asked would that be satisfactory to you Alderman if we took it out of there?

Alderman Forest stated I don't care where it comes from not at this point. Mr. MacKenzie, I understand now I may be wrong on this but I've been under the impression since 1955 that the Piscataquog River Park runs from the Biron Bridge to Varney and Douglas Street to Mast Road so I'm not sure where the boundaries are or when they were changed but that parks been there for a long time. Thank you, Bob.

Chairman Garrity asked Mr. MacKenzie what source...are you being specific on the source?

Mr. MacKenzie stated there's a specific Parks Improvement Program, which was \$1.875 million that has been used for several projects including Piscataquog, Sullivan Park and one of the bids for Douglas field did come in less than estimated and there's where we got the \$142,000 for the Piscataquog. As I remember there was roughly even in that portion \$10,000 also that was underbid on that project.

Chairman Garrity stated I know that you mentioned one project in Ward 9...that project's not complete yet...are we allowed to take monies out of that if the project's not completed yet?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I know that so far has been somewhat under the estimate but until the Parks Director says the project's done I don't normally recommend monies taken out unless the Parks Director says that he anticipates there's \$50,000 left in it.

Chairman Garrity stated Douglas Street also.

Mr. MacKenzie stated Douglas field...there's a new field being constructed at the end of Douglas Street...multi-purpose fields and I know that came in under bid.

Chairman Garrity stated and the other was for Piscataquog right.

Mr. MacKenzie stated yes. There were three or four projects.

Chairman Garrity stated I know Alderman Smith is lining up right after Alderman Forest for a request.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I understand but I think that Acting Director DePrima could probably answer that but I think two projects in that overall \$1.875 million came in under estimate.

Chairman Garrity stated three projects...one specific is Sullivan Family Park...Douglas fields and Piscataquog on the Parks Improvement Project this year. Are you expecting surpluses in each of those projects?

Mr. DePrima replied there was a surplus in one of the projects.

Chairman Garrity stated Douglas...we took \$142,000 out.

Mr. DePrima stated that leaves us a rough contingency of about \$42,000 in that particular account which is what we usually like to have for a project that size. We estimate the balance in the Sullivan Park, a surplus in that account as well... I'm not exactly sure what it is at this moment.

Chairman Garrity stated the other one was Piscataquog on this years Parks Improvement Program...was that the one, Bob?

Mr. MacKenzie replied no there was another...there was \$1.875 million in that total Parks Improvement Project. There was another park involved but I can't remember what it was.

Chairman Garrity asked was it Weston Observatory.

Mr. MacKenzie stated Weston Observatory...I think that's coming in a little under estimates.

Mr. DePrima stated that's coming in under estimates but we're comfortable with that. It wasn't a large surplus we still have roughly the contingency that we planned on for that project.

Chairman Garrity stated let me add it up here...\$30,000 out of surplus for either of those facilities...do you think that's available?

Mr. DePrima stated for Sullivan Park it would be.

Chairman Garrity asked so would that be to your satisfaction, Alderman Forest?

Alderman Osborne moved to move \$12,638 from Parks Improvement Project for security down at the West Side Ice Arena security issues. Alderman Gatsas duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Alderman Smith stated thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this. At Raco Theodore pool we had a swim meet down there and we also had a softball tournament down there. I have pictures and you can see the cars...everything's blocked off and you couldn't get a fire truck down Head Street if you wanted to and the residents have been very, very good and they are just concerned and I'm concerned and I was wondering last year when we built the pool we had preliminary sketches for parking and there just wasn't sufficient funds and so forth so I asked the Highway Department to draw up a plan...Kevin Sheppard's here... he did which I presented to you tonight approximately \$35,000 the cost for a parking lot for 48 spaces. This is right in by the bathhouse and I talked with Chuck DePrima and he has funds available for about \$17,000...we would need about \$18,000 to build this parking lot and if anybody goes down there...we have this state of the art pool and I grant you that half the problem is because the other fields are closed due to floods but we're getting a lot of activity and the only access in there and out is one way. I appreciate anything that you can do for us.

Chairman Garrity asked Chuck where's the \$17,000 coming from? He's looking for \$18,000 and you said you've got \$17,000 somewhere.

Mr. DePrima replied I don't recall the exact number but that's approximate. There was a balance in the Raco Theodore Pool project.

Chairman Garrity stated okay \$17,000 out of there and then the remaining \$18,000 would come out of Sullivan Family Park.

Alderman Osborne moved to transfer funds as outlined by Chairman Garrity for the so-called Raco Theodore Pool Parking Lot. Alderman Gatsas duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

There being no further business, to come before the Committee, on motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Gatsas, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee